

In The Drawings:

Please substitute the one sheet of drawings submitted herewith containing Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4 in place of the originally filed drawing sheet containing the same figures.

REMARKS

Introductory Comments:

Claims 1-20 are pending in the Application. Claims 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 4-6, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)(1) as being anticipated by Odell (2005/0062335 A1). Claims 1, 4-6, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Whiteman (US 2,997,344). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whiteman (US 2,997,344) in view of Achinami et al (US JP 2001032849 A). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whiteman (US 2,997,344) in view of Yuan (6,848,751). Claims 10-20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in the Office action. Claims 2-3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 3 and 6-9 are cancelled. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 1-2, 4-5, and 10-20.

In Response To The Drawing Objections:

Regarding the drawing objections discussed in paragraph 1 of the Office Action, The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the recitation of "a common external edge between said front portion and said back portion, said external edge comprising an ornamental spinning portion" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). In response, the Applicant has amended page 8, paragraph [0032] in accordance with claim 6 to clarify that the ornamental spinning portion refers to designs 46 and the common external edge refers to the external common edge 45. The Applicant believes this objection is hereby overcome. No new matter has been added.

Further the drawing shows reference number 34 in fig. 1 as external edge which is pointed to the inside of the back flange. In response, the Applicant has amended Figure 3 to clarify which common edge "34" refers to.

Regarding the drawing objections discussed in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the recitation of "a common internal edge comprising a roll surface" in claim 6 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). In response to this rejection, page 8, paragraph [0033] is amended to include that the substantially circular common internal edge refers to the inner common edge 44, and the roll surface refers to roll surface 48 in accordance with claim 6.

The Applicant believes that all drawing objections are overcome in view of the aforementioned amendments to the drawings and the Detailed Description of the Invention.

In Response To The Claim Objections:

Claims 2-3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response to this rejection, claim 1 is rewritten including the limitations of claim 3, and claim 3 is cancelled. Claim 1 is therefore believed to be allowable. Claims 2 and 4-5 depend from the amended claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least this reason.

In Response To The Claim Rejections:

Claims 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 6, lines 6-8, the phrase "a common external edge between said front portion and said back portion, said external edge comprising an ornamental spinning portion" was found confusing by the Examiner. In response to this rejection, page 8, paragraph [0032] is amended to clarify the Applicant's original intent that the ornamental spinning portion refers to designs 46

and the common external edge refers to the external common edge 45. No new matter has been added. This rejection is therefore believed to be overcome.

In claim 10, line 15-17, Examiner found the phrase "a common external edge between said second front portion and said second back portion, said external edge comprising an ornamental spinning portion" confusing as unclear as to which particular structure Applicant was referring to. In response, the Applicant clarifies that the external edge 45 includes the designs 46 (ornamental spinning portion) such that the edge 45 extends further outward in areas including the ornamental spinning portion, as illustrated in Figure 3. Claim 10 is believed to be allowable for at least this reason.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8 are rejected as being anticipated by Odell (2005/0062335 A1). The Office Action alleges that Odell discloses an attachment section for an internal spinning system comprising a front portion, a flange (14a) extending outwardly from said front portion in a substantially perpendicular manner, at least one bearing (18, 20) rotatably coupled to said flange in a substantially parallel manner such that said at least one bearing defines a roll support surface substantially perpendicular to said front portion, and a back portion (16) adapted to couple to a wheel, said back portion opposing said front portion, wherein said back portion and said front portion define a plurality of bolt holes.

Although the Applicant does not believe the present invention is anticipated by Odell, the Applicant nevertheless amends claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 3 and cancels claim 3. Claim 1 is believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth above regarding the claim objections. Claims 4-5 depend from the amended claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least this reason. Claims 6 and 8 are cancelled.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8 are rejected as being anticipated by Whiteman (US 2,997,344). Whiteman allegedly discloses an attachment section for an internal spinning system comprising a front portion, a flange (23) extending outwardly from said front portion in a substantially perpendicular manner, at least one bearing (29) rotatably coupled to said flange in a substantially parallel manner such that said at least one bearing defines a roll support surface substantially perpendicular to said front portion, and a back portion (15) adapted to couple to a wheel, said back portion opposing said

front portion, wherein said back portion and said front portion define a plurality of bolt holes.

The Applicants believe that the rejection of claims 1 and 4-5 is overcome as discussed above regarding the claim objections. Claims 6 and 8 are cancelled.

Claim 7 is rejected as being unpatentable over Whiteman (US 2,997,344) in view of Achinami et al (US JP 2001032849 A) and claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whiteman (US 2,997,344) in view of Yuan (6,848,751). Claims 7 and 9 are cancelled.

Conclusions:

In view of the aforementioned remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in a condition for allowance. A notice of allowability is therefore respectfully solicited. Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 50-0476.

Should the Examiner have any further questions or comments please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Justin H. Purcell
Reg. No. 53,493
28333 Telegraph Road
Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Dated: October 4, 2005